AFFORDABLE HOUSING ADVISORY BOARD
GROWTH MANAGEMENT/HOUSING TASK FORCE

A Summary of the 9.13.06 Preferences of Task Force Members

This idea received the most votes—six—and no vetoes: *(See 9.13.06 Tally of Votes, Incentives: State infrastructure grants and loans, p. 1)*

- **Increase rewards** for more housing production or more affordable housing production, such as bonus points for state grants and loans. Where possible, **target state and federal funds** where they will benefit housing opportunities. Include any or all of the following criteria for bonus points or eligibility for these funds (including brownfield redevelopment funding):
  - Housing affordability requirement - must demonstrate a clear public benefit for housing affordability
  - Urban centers
  - Densification in urban areas
  - Balancing jobs and housing growth

  Rural state highways

Each of these ideas received four votes and no vetoes:

- Provide **funding for land trusts or land banks** to purchase land for affordable housing; land would be publicly held and the cost would remain fixed. *(See 9.13.06 Tally of Votes, p. 2)*

- **Allocate more of the state's revenues to support infrastructure for growth**. For example, allow the Public Works Trust Fund to be used for projects that accommodate new housing growth, not just those that retain and rehabilitate infrastructure for existing developments to maintain levels of service (requires statutory change). *(See 9.13.06 Tally of Votes, p. 2-3)*

- Establish a **capitalized Growth Management infrastructure account** for projects that expand infrastructure capacity. *(See 9.13.06 Tally of Vote, p. 3)*

- **Cascade Agenda**/broader discussion of what we can do to make TDRs work from rural to urban areas for affordable housing. *(See 9.13.06 Tally of Votes, p. 6)*

These ideas received a combined total of five votes and no vetoes: *(See 9.13.06 Tally of Votes, State technical assistance, p. 8)*

- Provide **optional audit services** to local governments to review permitting processes for infill areas.

- Provide **assistance for cities to develop regional uniformity** or a general permit process for on-line permit applications (Snohomish County model and work being done by Kirkland and neighboring municipalities). Could provide a modular approach to land use regulations that locals can choose from to provide consistency for builders.

- Provide **state assistance for better coordination of planning** among counties with a regional approach to housing, jobs, master planned developments, etc. (e.g. Hood Canal Coordinating Council governance study for three counties and two Tribes on Hood Canal).

These ideas received a combined total of four votes and no vetoes: *(See 9.13.06 Tally of Votes, Economic Development, p. 8)*

- **Support job growth in eastern Washington** where there is affordable housing and infrastructure. For example, provide state incentives for industry to set up satellite plans in rural areas to crate jobs and housing balance.

- Provide **infrastructure funding to rural counties** to attract business in their urban growth areas.

- Encourage regional industry clusters.

- Stop spending public funds on economic development unless it is tied to a housing plan; quit providing funding to Central Puget Sound.

In addition, sixteen votes were cast for the variety of ideas under Comprehensive Plans *(See 9.13.06 Tally of Votes, p. 4-5)* but no idea received more than two votes. Two ideas were vetoed by one person or group. One idea—eliminate state concurrency requirements—was vetoed by three people or groups.

One idea received five votes but two vetoes: *(See 9.13.06 Tally of Votes, Streamline permitting, p. 6)*

- Eliminate SEPA review in urban growth areas.

Two other ideas received four votes and two vetoes:

- Regulatory provisions and expedited processes for affordable housing and encouraging infill - provide funding for local governments to adopt regulatory provisions and/or expedited processes for affordable housing and infill in urban areas, e.g. any one or combination of the following (they can be voted on as separate ideas): *(See 9.13.06 Tally of Votes, Incentives: State planning funds, p. 1-2)*
  - Expansion of use of State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) categorical exemptions

- o Zoning tools – lot size averaging, flag lots, accessory dwelling units, townhomes, small lots, cottage housing, etc.
  - o Mixed-use development; co-location of housing with public facilities (libraries, schools) or commercial developments (grocery stores) – make these an outright permitted use rather than conditional.
  - o Use of TDRs: make transfer of development rights (TDRs) from rural to urban areas work.
  - o Performance-based zoning – e.g. floor area ratios (FARs).
  - o Inclusionary zoning.
  - o Alternatives for dealing with stormwater that are less land intensive and provide more land for housing.
  - o Flexible short plats
  - o Form-based zoning
  - o Relaxed parking ratios
  - o Design review

- Adopt a no net loss of housing policy for adoption of critical areas, zoning and other ordinances. Require evaluation of new regulations for their impact on housing and jobs; require reallocation if there is a negative impact on housing. *(See 9.13.06 Tally of Votes, Development regulations and codes, p. 5)*

Four ideas related to impact fees received a total of nine votes and eight vetoes: *(See Tally of Votes, State Requirements, Funding Requirements, Local funds, p. 3)*

- Change or eliminate impact fees; provide local government with more broad-based funding sources such as REET.

- Improve the impact fee assessment process and calculation – assess impact fees at the time of occupancy instead of assessing them up front.

- Make impact fees roughly proportional to the impact to individual houses (reversal of *Drebick* decision).

- Require jurisdictions experiencing growth to impose impact fees.

Finally, many votes were cast for changing the tax system to reallocate tax revenues or provide local governments with greater flexibility or expand REET. No idea received more than three votes and a number of them received one or two vetoes. *(See 9.13.06 Tally of Votes, Tax Changes, State tax changes, p.6-7)*